

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND 103

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Fu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,287,993). Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu and Mori (US 6459197). Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juestel et al. (U.S. 20020027420) in view of Fu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,287,993). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the present invention, the adhesive of the present invention is used to the fluorescent lamp using an oxysulfide phosphor, thereby preventing the phosphor from coloring during the production process (See Page 25, lines 25-26 of the Specification). Through a lot of experiments, the inventors found this effect of preventing coloring for the first time.

On the other hand, Juestel discloses that an oxysulfide phosphor is used as a curved lamp but it neither discloses nor suggests that the oxysulfide phosphor is colored during the production process. Further, Fu neither discloses nor suggests that the use of an oxysulfide phosphor as an adhesive prevents the oxysulfide phosphor from coloring during the production process.

Therefore, the effect of preventing the oxysulfide phosphor from coloring during the production process is not obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art even if Fu is applied to Juestel.

In order to more fully distinguish applicants' invention from the cited references, independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite the oxysulfide phosphor. It is submitted that the claims are thus patentably distinguishable from the art of record.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600. Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 5077-000206/US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory A. Stobbs

Registration No.: 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. Box 828

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

(248) 641-1214

Attorney for Applicant